IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA

BECKLEY DIVISION

ELIZABETH A. MUSSER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO.: 5:06-0142
)	
JO ANNE B. BARNHART,)	
Commissioner of Social Security,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

This is an action seeking review of the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying the Plaintiff's Application for disability benefits under the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 401-433. This case was referred to the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge by Standing Order to consider the pleadings and evidence, and to submit Proposed Findings of Fact and Recommendation for disposition, all pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B).

On June 5, 2006, counsel for Plaintiff filed a Motion for voluntary dismissal of this action. (Doc. No. 10.) As Defendant has already filed an Answer, this action can be voluntarily dismissed only by Order of the Court, under Rule 41(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The

¹ Rule 41(a)(2) provides:

⁽²⁾ By Order of Court. Except as provided in paragraph (1) of this subdivision of this rule, an action shall not be dismissed at the plaintiff's instance save upon order of the court and upon such terms and conditions as the court deems proper. If a counterclaim has been pleaded by a defendant prior to the service upon the defendant of the plaintiff's motion to dismiss, the action shall not be dismissed against the defendant's objection unless the counterclaim can remain pending for independent adjudication by the court. Unless otherwise specified in the order, a dismissal under this paragraph is without prejudice.

purpose of this rule "is freely to allow voluntary dismissals unless the parties will be unfairly prejudiced." <u>Davis v. USX Corp.</u>, 819 F.2d 1270, 1273 (4th Cir. 1987). "A plaintiff's motion under Rule 41(a)(2) for dismissal without prejudice should not be denied absent substantial prejudice to the defendant." <u>Andes v. Versant Corp.</u>, 788 F.2d 1033, 1036 (4th Cir. 1986). It is well established that prejudice to the defendant does not result from the prospect of a second lawsuit. <u>See Vosburgh v. Indemnity Ins. Co. of North America</u>, 217 F.R.D. 384, 386 (S.D. W.Va. Sep. 12, 2003). In considering a motion under Rule 41(a)(2), the District Court should consider the following relevant, but non-dispositive, factors: "(1) the opposing party's effort and expense in preparing for trial; (2) excessive delay or lack of diligence on the part of the movant; (3) insufficient explanation of the need for a dismissal; and (4) the present stage of the litigation, i.e., whether a motion for summary judgment is pending." <u>Id</u>.

Regarding these four factors, the undersigned finds that this case has not proceeded beyond the Defendant's filing of an Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint. Although Defendant has expended some time in preparing an Answer to Plaintiff's Complaint and producing the Transcript of the administrative record, she has not incurred any considerable expense in preparing her brief in support of judgment on the pleadings. Concerning the third factor, the undersigned finds that despite Plaintiff's failure to provide any reason for requesting dismissal of this civil action, any prejudice to the Defendant has been slight, and dismissal of this case will bring an end to it. Accordingly, it is hereby respectfully **RECOMMENDED** that the District Court **GRANT** Plaintiff's Motion to voluntarily dismiss (Doc. No. 10.), deem this action and so Order it **voluntarily DISMISSED** without prejudice, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a), and remove it from the docket of the Court.

The parties are notified that this Proposed Findings and Recommendation is hereby **FILED**,

and a copy will be submitted to the Honorable David A. Faber, Chief United States District Judge.

Pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 636(b)(1)(B), and Rules 6(e) and

72(b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the parties shall have three days (mailing/service) and then

ten days (filing of objections) from the date of filing this Proposed Findings and Recommendation

within which to file with the Clerk of this Court, specific written objections, identifying the portions

of the Proposed Findings and Recommendation to which objection is made, and the basis of such

objection. Extension of this time period may be granted for good cause shown.

Failure to file written objections as set forth above shall constitute a waiver of de novo

review by the District Court and a waiver of appellate review by the Circuit Court of Appeals.

Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 155 (1985);

Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 846 (4th Cir. 1985); United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94

(4th Cir. 1984). Copies of such objections shall be served on opposing parties, Chief Judge Faber,

and this Magistrate Judge.

The Clerk is directed to file this Proposed Findings and Recommendation and to send a copy

of the same to counsel of record.

Date: June 7, 2006.

R. Clarke VanDervort

United States Magistrate Judge

3